arXiv:1412.0412v2 [math.GT] 5 Jan 2016

Tight triangulations of closed 3-manifolds

Bhaskar Bagchi[a], Basudeb Datta[b], Jonathan Spreer[c]

[a] *Theoretical Statistics and Mathematics Unit, Indian Statistical Institute, Bangalore 560 059, India. bbagchi@isibang.ac.in*

[b] *Department of Mathematics, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore 560 012, India. dattab@math.iisc.ernet.in.*

[c] *School of Mathematics and Physics, The University of Queensland, Brisbane QLD 4072, Australia. j.spreer@uq.edu.au.*

(European Journal of Combinatorics 54 (2016) 103–120.)

Abstract

A triangulation of a closed 2-manifold is tight with respect to a field of characteristic two if and only if it is neighbourly; and it is tight with respect to a field of odd characteristic if and only if it is neighbourly and orientable. No such characterization of tightness was previously known for higher dimensional manifolds. In this paper, we prove that a triangulation of a closed 3-manifold is tight with respect to a field of odd characteristic if and only if it is neighbourly, orientable and stacked. In consequence, the Kühnel-Lutz conjecture is valid in dimension three for fields of odd characteristic.

Next let $\mathbb{F}$ be a field of characteristic two. It is known that, in this case, any neighbourly and stacked triangulation of a closed 3-manifold is $\mathbb{F}$-tight. For closed, triangulated 3-manifolds with at most 71 vertices or with first Betti number at most 188, we show that the converse is true. But the possibility of the existence of an $\mathbb{F}$-tight, non-stacked triangulation on a larger number of vertices remains open. We prove the following upper bound theorem on such triangulations. If an $\mathbb{F}$-tight triangulation of a closed 3-manifold has n vertices and first Betti number β_1, then $(n-4)(617n-3861) \leq 15444\beta_1$. Equality holds here if and only if all the vertex links of the triangulation are connected sums of boundary complexes of icosahedra.

MSC 2010 : 57Q15, 57R05.

Keywords: Stacked spheres; Stacked manifolds; Triangulations of 3-manifolds; Tight triangulations; Icosahedron.

1 Introduction

All simplicial complexes considered in this paper are finite and abstract. All homologies are simplicial homologies with coefficients in a field $\mathbb{F}$. The vertex set of a simplicial complex X will be denoted by $V(X)$. For $A \subseteq V(X)$, the induced subcomplex $X[A]$ of X on the vertex set A is defined by $X[A] := \{\alpha \in X : \alpha \subseteq A\}$. A simplicial complex X is said to be a *triangulated manifold* if it triangulates a manifold, i.e., if the geometric carrier $|X|$ of X is a topological manifold. A closed, triangulated d-manifold X is said to be $\mathbb{F}$-*orientable* if $H_d(X;\mathbb{F}) \neq 0$. So, for a field $\mathbb{F}$ of characteristic two, any closed, triangulated manifold is $\mathbb{F}$-orientable.

Taking his cue from pre-existing notions of tightness in the theory of smooth and polyhedral embedding of manifolds in Euclidean spaces, Kühnel [15] introduced the following precise notion of tightness of a simplicial complex with respect to a field.

Definition 1.1. Let X be a simplicial complex and $\mathbb{F}$ be a field. We say that X is *tight with respect to* $\mathbb{F}$ (in short, $\mathbb{F}$-*tight*) if (a) X is connected, and (b) the $\mathbb{F}$-linear map $H_*(Y;\mathbb{F}) \to H_*(X;\mathbb{F})$, induced by the inclusion map $Y \hookrightarrow X$, is injective for every induced subcomplex Y of X.

Recall that, if X is a simplicial complex of dimension d, then its *face numbers* $f_i(X)$ are defined by $f_i(X) := \#\{\alpha \in X : \dim(\alpha) = i\}$, $0 \leq i \leq d$. For $k \geq 2$, a simplicial complex X is said to be k-*neighbourly* if any set of k vertices of X forms a face, i.e., if $f_{k-1}(X) = \binom{f_0(X)}{k}$. A 2-neighbourly simplicial complex is called *neighbourly*.

Definition 1.2. A simplicial complex X is said to be *strongly minimal* if, for every triangulation Y of the geometric carrier $|X|$ of X, we have $f_i(X) \leq f_i(Y)$ for all i, $0 \leq i \leq \dim(X)$.

Thus, a strongly minimal triangulation of a topological space, if it exists, is the most economical among all possible triangulations of the space. Unfortunately, there are very few combinatorial criteria available in the literature which ensure strong minimality. The notion of tightness is of great importance in combinatorial topology because of the following tantalizing conjecture [16].

Conjecture 1.3 (Kühnel-Lutz)**.** *For any field* $\mathbb{F}$*, every* $\mathbb{F}$*-tight, closed, triangulated manifold is strongly minimal.*

Intuitively, $\mathbb{F}$-tightness of a triangulated manifold X means that all parts of X are essential in order to capture the $\mathbb{F}$-homology of the topological space $|X|$. In view of this intuition, Conjecture 1.3 appears to be entirely plausible. However, Example 6.3 shows that this intuition is not correct for arbitrary simplicial complexes.

Before we proceed, let us recall the notion of stackedness from [20].

Definition 1.4. A triangulated manifold Δ of dimension $d+1$ is said to be *stacked* if all its faces of codimension (at least) two are contained in the boundary $\partial\Delta$. A closed, triangulated manifold M of dimension d is said to be *stacked* if there is a stacked triangulated manifold Δ of dimension $d+1$ such that $M = \partial\Delta$.

In particular, a *stacked sphere* is a triangulated sphere which may be realized as the boundary of a stacked triangulated ball.

Definition 1.5. A triangulated manifold is said to be *locally stacked* if all its vertex links are stacked spheres or stacked balls.

Clearly, all stacked triangulated manifolds are locally stacked, but the converse is false (see Example 6.2). Locally stacked triangulations are a rich source of tight triangulations. With just a few exceptions, all known tight triangulated manifolds are locally stacked. From [5], we know that when $d \neq 3$, an $\mathbb{F}$-orientable, neighbourly, locally stacked, triangulated d-manifold is $\mathbb{F}$-tight. See Effenberger [10] for a proof of this in the case $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{Z}_2$. But this result is not true in dimension 3 (c.f. Example 6.2). Due to [5, Theorem 2.24; case $k = 1$] we have the following.

Proposition 1.6 (Bagchi-Datta)**.** *Let* M *be a locally stacked,* $\mathbb{F}$*-orientable, neighbourly, closed, triangulated* 3*-manifold. Then the following are equivalent*

(i) M *is* $\mathbb{F}$*-tight,*

(ii) *M is stacked, and*

(iii) $\binom{f_0(M)-4}{2} = 10\beta_1(M;\mathbb{F})$.

Thus, all $\mathbb{F}$-orientable, neighbourly, stacked, closed, triangulated 3-manifolds are $\mathbb{F}$-tight (for any field $\mathbb{F}$). Note that for $d \geq 4$, the notions of stackedness and local stackedness coincide for triangulated manifolds ([13, 5, 20]). In conjunction with Proposition 1.6, this shows that it is stackedness (as opposed to local stackedness) which seems to be central to tightness. The notion of stackedness was introduced by Walkup [23] and McMullen & Walkup [18] in the context of triangulated spheres. The close relationship between stackedness and tightness has been highlighted in [1, 5, 6, 19]. This is further borne out by Theorem 4.8 of this article.

In [6], it was shown that the Kühnel-Lutz conjecture is true for locally stacked manifolds. Namely, we have

Proposition 1.7 (Bagchi-Datta)**.** *For any field $\mathbb{F}$, every $\mathbb{F}$-tight, locally stacked, closed, triangulated manifold is strongly minimal.*

The first main result of this paper (in Section 4) is an extension of Proposition 1.6: If a closed, triangulated 3-manifold is tight with respect to a field of odd characteristic then it must be (orientable, neighbourly and) stacked. This result answers Question 4.5 of [9] affirmatively, in the case of odd characteristic. As a consequence of Proposition 1.7 it follows that the Kühnel-Lutz conjecture is true in a special case, namely, if $\mathrm{char}(\mathbb{F}) \neq 2$ then any $\mathbb{F}$-tight, closed, triangulated 3-manifold is strongly minimal.

Let X_1 and X_2 be two triangulated d-manifolds intersecting in a common facet (d-face) α. That is, $X_1 \cap X_2 = \bar{\alpha}$, where $\bar{\alpha}$ denotes α together with all of its subfaces. Then $X_1 \# X_2 = (X_1 \cup X_2) \setminus \{\alpha\}$ is said to be the *connected sum of X_1 and X_2 along α* (for a more general definition, see the end of Section 2). Let $I = I^2_{12}$ be the boundary complex of the icosahedron. Thus, I is a triangulated 2-sphere on 12 vertices. It is well known that I is the unique triangulation of S^2 in which each vertex is of degree 5. We introduce:

Definition 1.8. A triangulated 2-sphere is said to be *icosian* if it is a connected sum of finitely many copies of I. A triangulated 3-manifold is said to be *locally icosian* if all its vertex links are icosian.

In [22], the third author proved the following interesting upper bound theorem for tight triangulations of odd dimensional manifolds.

Proposition 1.9 (Spreer)**.** *Let M be an $(\ell-1)$-connected, closed, triangulated $(2\ell+1)$-manifold. If M is $\mathbb{F}$-tight, then* $\binom{\lfloor \frac{f_0(M)}{2} \rfloor - 1}{\ell+1}\binom{\lceil \frac{f_0(M)}{2} \rceil - 1}{\ell+1} / \binom{f_0(M)-1}{\ell+1} \leq \beta_\ell(M;\mathbb{F})$.

In Section 5, we consider fields of characteristic 2. According to Proposition 1.6, every neighbourly, stacked, closed, triangulated 3-manifold M is $\mathbb{Z}_2$-tight. We do not know whether the converse is true or not. But in this paper we prove that if M is a $\mathbb{Z}_2$-tight, closed, triangulated 3-manifold with $f_0(M) \leq 71$ or $\beta_1(M;\mathbb{Z}_2) \leq 188$, then M must be stacked and neighbourly (and therefore $\binom{f_0(M)-4}{2} = 10\beta_1(M;\mathbb{Z}_2)$). We also show that, in general, each vertex link of a $\mathbb{Z}_2$-tight, closed, triangulated 3-manifold must be a connected sum of I's and S^2_4's. Further, we prove that any $\mathbb{Z}_2$-tight, closed, triangulated 3-manifold M satisfies the following upper bound on $f_0(M)$:

$$(f_0(M)-4)(617f_0(M)-3861) \leq 15444\beta_1(M;\mathbb{Z}_2).$$

Equality holds here if and only if M is locally icosian. In conjunction with the fact that $\binom{f_0(M)-4}{2} = 10\beta_1(M;\mathbb{Z}_2)$ when $f_0(M) \leq 71$, this inequality improves upon the upper bound of Proposition 1.9 in case $l = 1$. We also prove that, if there is a non-stacked, $\mathbb{F}$-tight, triangulated 3-manifold M, then its integral homology group $H_1(M;\mathbb{Z})$ must have an element of order 2. The results of Section 5 were largely suggested by extensive machine computations using simpcomp [11]. Altogether, these results impose severe restrictions on the topology of 3-manifolds admitting tight triangulations (cf. Corollary 5.14).

In Section 6, we present some examples to show that converses and generalizations of several results proved here are not true.

Remark 1.10. Tight triangulations of 3-manifolds are not as rare as one might think. Recently, it has been found in [8] that $(20m + 9)$-vertex tight, triangulated 3-manifolds exist for all $m \leq 5$. The paper [8] lists 76 non-isomorphic tight triangulations with these parameters including Walkup's 9-vertex 3-dimensional Klein bottle. Existence of these examples makes it natural to pose the following conjecture.

Conjecture 1.11. *There exist n-vertex, tight, closed, triangulated 3-manifolds for all $n \equiv 9$ (mod 20).*

However, all the examples in [8] are actually stacked. Indeed, in view of Theorems 5.6 and 5.11 of this paper, if non-stacked, tight, triangulated 3-manifolds are to exist, then their structure and parameters must be extremely restrictive. These results suggest the following conjecture (which we prove here in odd characteristic).

Conjecture 1.12. *A closed, triangulated 3-manifold is $\mathbb{F}$-tight (if and) only if it is $\mathbb{F}$-orientable, neighbourly and stacked.*

In the Oberwolfach workshop on 'Geometric and Algebraic Combinatorics' held in February, 2015, the first author gave a lecture based on this article. There he posed the following [14].

Problem 1.13 (Bagchi)**.** *Let X be an $\mathbb{F}$-tight simplicial complex such that the link in X of some vertex is an $\mathbb{F}$-homology $(d-1)$-sphere. Then prove or disprove: X must be a triangulation of a closed $\mathbb{F}$-homology d-manifold.*

Notice that this is trivial if $d = 1$. Theorem 3.5 provides an affirmative solution of this problem for $d = 2$.

2 Preliminaries on stacked and tight triangulations

In this section we recapitulate a few elementary consequences of tightness. For completeness, we include their proofs. We shall use :

Notation 2.1. If x is a vertex of a simplicial complex X, then X^x and X_x will denote the antistar and the link (respectively) of x in X. Thus,

$$X^x := \{\alpha \in X \,:\, x \notin \alpha\} = X[V(X) \setminus \{x\}],$$
$$X_x := \{\alpha \in X : x \notin \alpha, \alpha \sqcup \{x\} \in X\}.$$

A face $\{u_1, \ldots, u_m\}$ in a simplicial complex is also denoted by $u_1 u_2 \cdots u_m$. If X is a simplicial complex and $a \notin X$ is an element then the *cone* with apex a and base X is the simplicial complex $X \cup \{\alpha \cup \{a\} : \alpha \in X\}$ and is denoted by $a * X$. For a simplicial complex X of dimension d, and for $0 \leq k \leq d$, the *k-skeleton* $\mathrm{skel}_k(X)$ is defined by

$$\mathrm{skel}_k(X) := \{\alpha \in X : \dim(\alpha) \leq k\}.$$

Lemma 2.2. *Every $\mathbb{F}$-tight simplicial complex is neighbourly.*

Proof. Suppose, if possible, $x \neq y$ are two vertices of an $\mathbb{F}$-tight simplicial complex X such that xy is not an edge of X. Let Y be the induced subcomplex of X on the set $\{x, y\}$. Then $\beta_0(Y; \mathbb{F}) = 2 > 1 = \beta_0(X; \mathbb{F})$, so that $H_0(Y; \mathbb{F}) \to H_0(X; \mathbb{F})$ can not be injective. This is a contradiction since X is $\mathbb{F}$-tight. □

Lemma 2.3. *Every induced subcomplex of an $\mathbb{F}$-tight simplicial complex is $\mathbb{F}$-tight.*

Proof. Let Y be an induced subcomplex of an $\mathbb{F}$-tight simplicial complex X. By Lemma 2.2, X is neighbourly and hence Y is also neighbourly. So Y is connected. Let Z be an induced subcomplex of Y. Then Z is an induced subcomplex of X also. Since the composition of the linear maps $H_*(Z; \mathbb{F}) \to H_*(Y; \mathbb{F}) \to H_*(X; \mathbb{F})$ is injective, the first of them must be injective. Thus, $H_*(Z; \mathbb{F}) \to H_*(Y; \mathbb{F})$ is injective for all induced subcomplexes Z of Y. Therefore, Y is $\mathbb{F}$-tight. □

Lemma 2.4. *If X is an $\mathbb{F}$-tight simplicial complex of dimension d, then $\mathrm{skel}_k(X)$ is $\mathbb{F}$-tight for $1 \leq k \leq d$.*

Proof. Since $k \geq 1$ and X is neighbourly by Lemma 2.2, it follows that $\mathrm{skel}_k(X)$ is neighbourly and hence connected. Let Y be an induced subcomplex of $\mathrm{skel}_k(X)$. Then $Y = \mathrm{skel}_k(W)$, where W is an induced subcomplex of X. Since X is $\mathbb{F}$-tight, it follows that, for $0 \leq i \leq k-1$, $H_i(Y) = H_i(W) \to H_i(X) = H_i(\mathrm{skel}_k(X))$ is injective. Clearly, $Z_k(Y) \subseteq Z_k(\mathrm{skel}_k(X))$. Since both Y and $\mathrm{skel}_k(X)$ are of dimension $\leq k$, $B_k(Y) = 0 = B_k(\mathrm{skel}_k(X))$. Therefore, $H_k(Y) \to H_k(\mathrm{skel}_k(X))$ is injective. □

Lemma 2.5. *Every $\mathbb{F}$-tight, closed, triangulated manifold is $\mathbb{F}$-orientable.*

Proof. Let X be an $\mathbb{F}$-tight, closed, triangulated d-manifold. We can assume that $d \geq 2$. Since X is a connected, closed, triangulated d-manifold, it is easy to see ab initio that, for any proper subcomplex Y of X, $H_d(Y; \mathbb{F}) = 0$. Now fix a vertex x of X, and consider the induced subcomplex X^x of X on the complement of x. Then $X = X^x \cup (x * X_x)$ and $X^x \cap (x * X_x) = X_x$. Since $H_d(X^x; \mathbb{F}) = 0$, $H_{d-1}(x * X_x; \mathbb{F}) = 0$, $H_{d-1}(X_x; \mathbb{F}) = \mathbb{F}$ and $H_*(X^x; \mathbb{F}) \to H_*(X; \mathbb{F})$ is injective, it follows from the exactness of the Mayer-Vietoris sequence

$$\begin{aligned}\cdots \to & H_d(X^x; \mathbb{F}) \oplus H_d(x * X_x; \mathbb{F}) \to H_d(X; \mathbb{F}) \to H_{d-1}(X_x; \mathbb{F}) \\ \to & H_{d-1}(X^x; \mathbb{F}) \oplus H_{d-1}(x * X_x; \mathbb{F}) \to H_{d-1}(X; \mathbb{F}) \to \cdots\end{aligned}$$

that $H_d(X; \mathbb{F}) = \mathbb{F}$. □

Let X be a simplicial complex of dimension d. In [6], the first two authors have defined the sigma vector $(\sigma_0, \sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_d)$ of X with respect to a field $\mathbb{F}$ as

$$\sigma_i = \sigma_i(X; \mathbb{F}) := \sum_{A \subseteq V(X)} \tilde{\beta}_i(X[A]) \Big/ \binom{f_0(X)}{\#(A)}, \; 0 \leq i \leq d,$$

and $\sigma_i(X;\mathbb{F}) = 0$ for $i > \dim(X)$. Here $\#(A)$ denotes the number of vertices in A. Also, we have adopted the convention that $\widetilde{\beta}_0(\{\emptyset\}) = -1$ and $\widetilde{\beta}_i(\{\emptyset\}) = 0$ if $i > 0$. Note that, in consequence, $\sigma_0(X)$ may be a negative rational number. In this paper, we introduce the following normalization of the sigma vector which will be referred to as the *sigma-star* vector.

$$\sigma_i^* = \sigma_i^*(X;\mathbb{F}) := \frac{\sigma_i(X;\mathbb{F})}{1 + f_0(X)},\ i \geq 0.$$

(See Theorem 5.7 for a justification of this normalization.) In [2], the first author introduced the mu-vector $(\mu_0, \ldots, \mu_d)$ with respect to $\mathbb{F}$ of a d-dimensional simplicial complex as follows.

$$\mu_0 = \mu_0(X;\mathbb{F}) := \sum_{x \in V(X)} \frac{1}{1 + f_0(X_x)},$$

$$\mu_i = \mu_i(X;\mathbb{F}) := \delta_{i1}\mu_0(X;\mathbb{F}) + \sum_{x \in V(X)} \sigma_{i-1}^*(X_x;\mathbb{F}),\ 1 \leq i \leq d.$$

Here δ_{i1} denotes Kronecker's symbol. Thus, $\delta_{i1} = 1$ if $i = 1$, and $= 0$ otherwise. Notice that $\mu_1(X;\mathbb{F})$ is independent of the field $\mathbb{F}$. Therefore, we will write $\mu_1(X)$ for $\mu_1(X;\mathbb{F})$. We have the following

Lemma 2.6. *Let M be an $\mathbb{F}$-orientable, neighbourly, closed, triangulated 3-manifold. Then $\beta_1(M;\mathbb{F}) \leq \mu_1(M)$. Equality holds here if and only if M is $\mathbb{F}$-tight.*

Proof. The inequality (as well as the fact that equality holds if M is $\mathbb{F}$-tight) is a special case of [2, Corollary 1.9]. Suppose $\mu_1 = \beta_1$. Since M is 2-neighbourly, it also satisfies $\mu_0 = 1 = \beta_0$. By [2, Theorem 1.7], $\mu_2 = \mu_1$ and $\mu_3 = \mu_0$. Also, since M is $\mathbb{F}$-orientable, Poincaré duality implies $\beta_2 = \beta_1$ and $\beta_3 = \beta_0$. Therefore, $\mu_2 = \beta_2$ and $\mu_3 = \beta_3$. Hence [2, Corollary 1.9] implies that M is $\mathbb{F}$-tight. □

Recall that a closed, triangulated d-manifold X is called *orientable* if $H_d(X;\mathbb{Z}) \neq 0$. It follows from the universal coefficient theorem that, for a field $\mathbb{F}$ of odd characteristic, a closed, triangulated manifold is $\mathbb{F}$-orientable if and only if it is orientable.

Corollary 2.7. *Let p be a prime and let M be an orientable, closed, triangulated 3-manifold. If M is $\mathbb{Z}_p$-tight but not $\mathbb{Q}$-tight, then p divides the order of the torsion subgroup of $H_1(M;\mathbb{Z})$.*

Proof. The hypothesis and Lemma 2.6 imply that $\beta_1(M;\mathbb{Q}) < \mu_1(M) = \beta_1(M;\mathbb{Z}_p)$. Hence the result follows from the universal coefficient theorem. □

The following lemma is immediate from the definition of tightness.

Lemma 2.8. (a) *A simplicial complex is tight with respect to a field of characteristic p if and only if it is $\mathbb{Z}_p$-tight.* (b) *A simplicial complex is tight with respect to a field of characteristic zero if and only if it is $\mathbb{Z}_p$-tight for all primes p.*

For any non-empty finite set α, $\overline{\alpha}$ will denote the simplicial complex whose faces are all the subsets of α. Thus, if $\#(\alpha) = d+1$, $\overline{\alpha}$ is the standard triangulation of the d-ball (namely, it is the face complex of the geometric d-simplex). If $\#(\alpha) = d+2$, then the boundary $\partial\overline{\alpha}$ of $\overline{\alpha}$ is the standard triangulation of the d-sphere; it will be denoted by S^d_{d+2}. (More generally, S^d_n usually denotes an n-vertex triangulation of the d-sphere.) From the definition of a stacked sphere, one can deduce the following (this also follows from [4, Lemmas 4.3 (b) & 4.8 (b)]).

Lemma 2.9. *A simplicial complex S is a stacked d-sphere if and only if S is a connected sum of finitely many copies of the $(d+2)$-vertex standard sphere S^d_{d+2}.*

Let X be a closed, triangulated manifold and let σ and τ be facets of X. For a bijection $\psi : \sigma \to \tau$, let X^ψ be the simplicial complex obtained from $X \setminus \{\sigma, \tau\}$ by identifying v and $\psi(v)$ for $v \in \sigma$. If $\mathrm{lk}_X(v) \cap \mathrm{lk}_X(\psi(v)) = \{\emptyset\}$ for each vertex $v \in \sigma$, then X^ψ is a triangulated manifold. If σ and τ belong to different connected components, say $\sigma \in X_1$, $\tau \in X_2$ and $X = X_1 \sqcup X_2$, then X^ψ is said to be the *connected sum* of X_1 and X_2 and is denoted by $X_1 \#_\psi X_2$. If σ and τ belong to the same connected component of X, then X^ψ is said to be obtained from X by a *combinatorial handle addition*. For $d \geq 2$, we recursively define the class $\mathcal{H}^{d+1}(k)$ as follows. $\mathcal{H}^{d+1}(0)$ is the set of stacked d-spheres. A triangulated d-manifold is in $\mathcal{H}^{d+1}(k+1)$ if it is obtained from a member of $\mathcal{H}^{d+1}(k)$ by a combinatorial handle addition. The *Walkup's class* $\mathcal{H}^{d+1}$ is the union $\mathcal{H}^{d+1} = \bigcup_{k \geq 0} \mathcal{H}^{d+1}(k)$. In [13], Kalai proved

Proposition 2.10 (Kalai)**.** *Let M be a connected, closed, triangulated manifold of dimension $d \geq 4$. Then M is locally stacked if and only if M is in $\mathcal{H}^{d+1}$.*

Example 6.2 shows that Proposition 2.10 does not hold in dimension 3. From [9] we know the following.

Proposition 2.11 (Datta-Murai)**.** *Let M be a connected, closed, triangulated manifold of dimension $d \geq 2$. Then M is stacked if and only if M is in $\mathcal{H}^{d+1}$.*

3 Induced surfaces in tight triangulations

Let X_x and X^x be as in Notation 2.1. If $x \neq y$ are two vertices of a simplicial complex X, then we shall also use notations such as X^x_y for $(X^x)_y = (X_y)^x$. We say that two vertices in a simplicial complex X are adjacent (or, that they are neighbours) if they form an edge of X. We now introduce:

Notation 3.1. If $x \neq y$ are vertices of a simplicial complex X, then $c_X(x, y)$ will denote the number of distinct connected components K of X^x_y such that x is adjacent in X_y with some vertex in K.

Lemma 3.2. *If X is an $\mathbb{F}$-tight simplicial complex then for all $x \in V(X)$, we have $\beta_1(X; \mathbb{F}) = \tilde{\beta}_0(X_x; \mathbb{F}) + \beta_1(X^x; \mathbb{F})$.*

Proof. Clearly, $X = X^x \cup (x * X_x)$ and $X^x \cap (x * X_x) = X_x$. Therefore, the Mayer-Vietoris theorem yields the exact sequence (noting that the cone $x * X_x$ is homologically trivial)

$$H_1(X^x; \mathbb{F}) \to H_1(X; \mathbb{F}) \to \widetilde{H}_0(X_x; \mathbb{F}) \to \widetilde{H}_0(X^x; \mathbb{F}).$$

Since X^x is an induced subcomplex of the $\mathbb{F}$-tight complex X, the map $H_1(X^x; \mathbb{F}) \to H_1(X; \mathbb{F})$ is injective. Lemma 2.2 implies that X^x is connected and hence $\widetilde{H}_0(X^x; \mathbb{F}) = 0$. So we have the short exact sequence

$$0 \to H_1(X^x; \mathbb{F}) \to H_1(X; \mathbb{F}) \to \widetilde{H}_0(X_x; \mathbb{F}) \to 0.$$

Hence we get the result. □

Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3 show that tightness is a severe structural constraint on a simplicial complex. So it is surprising that, beyond these two lemmas, no further structural (combinatorial) consequence of tightness seems to have been known. The following lemma establishes a strong structural restriction on the 2-skeleton of an $\mathbb{F}$-tight simplicial complex.

Lemma 3.3. *Let X be an $\mathbb{F}$-tight simplicial complex for some field $\mathbb{F}$. Then, for any two distinct vertices x, y of X, we have $c_X(x, y) = c_X(y, x)$.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.2, $\beta_1(X) = \tilde{\beta}_0(X_x) + \beta_1(X^x)$. Since X^x is also tight by Lemma 2.3, applying Lemma 3.2 to the vertex y of X^x, we get $\beta_1(X^x) = \tilde{\beta}_0(X^x_y) + \beta_1(X^{xy})$. Therefore, $\beta_1(X) = \tilde{\beta}_0(X_x) + \tilde{\beta}_0(X^x_y) + \beta_1(X^{xy})$. Interchanging the vertices x and y in this argument yields $\beta_1(X) = \tilde{\beta}_0(X_y) + \tilde{\beta}_0(X^y_x) + \beta_1(X^{yx})$. Since $X^{xy} = X^{yx}$, we get

$$\tilde{\beta}_0(X^x_y) - \tilde{\beta}_0(X_y) = \tilde{\beta}_0(X^y_x) - \tilde{\beta}_0(X_x).$$

But the two sides of this equation are just one less than $c_X(x, y)$ and $c_X(y, x)$. Hence the result. □

In the following, we will make use of some basic concepts from graph theory, where in our context a *graph* can be seen as a simplicial complex of dimension ≤ 1. In this paper, we do not use any non-trivial results from graph theory, but the language and the geometric intuition of graph theory will be useful. Recall that the *degree* of a vertex v (denoted by $\deg(v)$) in a simplicial complex is the number of edges (1-faces) through v. A graph is said to be *regular*, if all its vertices have the same degree. For $n \geq 3$, the *cycle of length n* (in short, *n-cycle*) is the unique connected regular graph of degree two on n vertices. It is the unique n-vertex triangulation of the circle S^1. An n-cycle with edges $a_1a_2, \ldots, a_{n-1}a_n, a_na_1$ will be denoted by $C_n(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$. For $n \geq 1$, the *path of length n* (the n-path) is the antistar of a vertex in the $(n + 2)$-cycle. By an *induced cycle* (resp., path) in a simplicial complex X, we mean an induced subcomplex of X which is a cycle (resp., path). Notice that, in particular, a 3-cycle is induced in X if and only if it does not bound a triangle (2-face) in X. When $n \geq 4$, an n-cycle is induced in X if and only if it is induced in the graph $\mathrm{skel}_1(X)$. A connected acyclic graph is called a *tree*.

Lemma 3.4. *Let the link of some vertex x in a 2-dimensional $\mathbb{F}$-tight simplicial complex X be a cycle. Then X is a triangulation of a closed 2-manifold.*

Proof. Let $C = X_x$ be a cycle. Fix a vertex $y \neq x$ of X. It suffices to show that the link X_y is also a cycle. Note that, since X is neighbourly (Lemma 2.2), y is a vertex of C. Let z and w be the two neighbours of y in C. It follows that z and w are the only two neighbours of the vertex x in the graph X_y. Therefore, it suffices to show that X^x_y is a path joining z and w.

Since $X_x = C$ is a cycle and $X^y_x = C^y$ is a path, they are both connected. So $c_X(y, x) = 1$. Therefore, by Lemma 3.3, $c_X(x, y) = 1$. That is, the vertices z and w (being the two neighbours of x in X_y) belong to the same component of X^x_y. Thus, there is a path in X^x_y joining z to w. Let P be a shortest path in the graph X^x_y joining z to w. Then, P is an induced path in X^x_y. Take any vertex $v \neq x, y, z, w$ in X. (If there is no such vertex then X^x_y is the edge zw, and we are done.) We will show that $v \in P$. Look at the induced subcomplex $Y = X^v$ of X. Then $Y_x = X^v_x = C^v$ is a path in which y is an interior vertex. So $Y^y_x = C^{vy}$ is the disjoint union of two paths. The vertex z belongs to one of these two paths and w belongs to the other. Therefore, $c_Y(y, x) = 2$. By Lemma 2.3, Y is also

$\mathbb{F}$-tight. So, by Lemma 3.3, $c_Y(x,y) = 2$. That is, the neighbours z and w of x in Y_y belong to different components of Y_y^x. Therefore, v belongs to the path P (or else P would be a path in Y_y^x joining z and w). Since $v \neq z, w$ was an arbitrary vertex of X_y^x, this shows that the path P is a spanning path in X_y^x (i.e., it passes through all the vertices). Since P is also an induced path in X_y^x, it follows that $X_y^x = P$ is a path joining z and w. □

The following result is a straightforward consequence of Lemma 3.4. Notice that there is no restriction on the dimension of M in this result, and M need not be a triangulated manifold.

Theorem 3.5. *Let the simplicial complex M be tight with respect to some field. Let C be an induced cycle in the link of a vertex x in M. Then the induced subcomplex of M on the vertex set of the cone $x * C$ is a closed, triangulated 2-manifold.*

Proof. Let $Y = M[V(C) \cup \{x\}]$ and let $X = \mathrm{skel}_2(Y)$. Then, by Lemmas 2.3 and 2.4, X is $\mathbb{F}$-tight. Clearly, X is two dimensional and $X_x = C$ is a cycle. Thus, by Lemma 3.4, X is a closed, triangulated 2-manifold. To complete the proof, it suffices to show that $Y = X$, i.e., that $\dim(Y) = 2$. Suppose, if possible, $\dim(Y) > 2$. Take a 3-face $\alpha \in Y$. Then the induced subcomplex of $X = \mathrm{skel}_2(Y)$ on the vertex set α is a 4-vertex triangulated 2-sphere. Since X is a connected, closed, triangulated 2-manifold, it follows that $X = S_4^2$, and $V(X) = \alpha$. Thus C is the 3-cycle on the vertex set $\alpha \setminus \{x\}$. But, the 2-face $\alpha \setminus \{x\}$ is in $Y_x \subseteq M_x$. This contradicts the assumption that C is an induced cycle in the link M_x. □

Corollary 3.6. *Let S be the link of some vertex in an $\mathbb{F}$-tight simplicial complex M.*

(a) *If* $\mathrm{char}(\mathbb{F}) = 2$*, then S has no induced cycle of length* $\equiv 1 \pmod 3$.

(b) *If* $\mathrm{char}(\mathbb{F}) \neq 2$*, then S has no induced cycle of length* $\equiv 0, 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9$ *or* $10 \pmod{12}$.

Proof. Let $x \in V(M)$ and let C be an induced n-cycle in $S = M_x$. By Theorem 3.5, the induced subcomplex $X = M[V(C) \cup \{x\}]$ is an $(n+1)$-vertex, closed, triangulated 2-manifold. By Lemma 2.2, X is neighbourly. So it has $n+1$ vertices, $n(n+1)/2$ edges and hence $n(n+1)/3$ triangles. So 3 divides $n(n+1)$, i.e., $n \not\equiv 1 \pmod 3$. This proves part (a).

If $\mathrm{char}(\mathbb{F}) \neq 2$ then, by Lemmas 2.3 and 2.5, X is an orientable, triangulated 2-manifold. So its Euler characteristic $\chi(X) = (n+1)(6-n)/6$ is an even number. Thus, $n \not\equiv 0, 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9$ or $10 \pmod{12}$. This proves part (b). □

4 Odd characteristic

In this section, we prove that any triangulated 3-manifold is tight with respect to a field of odd characteristic if and only if it is neighbourly, orientable and stacked. For this, we first need some additional preliminary results on triangulations of the 2-sphere.

Lemma 4.1. *Let S be a triangulation of S^2. If S has no induced cycle of length ≤ 5 then $S = S_4^2$.*

Proof. Let x be a vertex of minimum degree in S. It is well known (and easy to prove) that the minimum degree of any triangulation of S^2 is at most five. So $\deg(x) = 3, 4$ or 5.

If $\deg(x) = 4$ or 5, then S_x is a 4-cycle or a 5-cycle in S, and hence it is not induced. So there are vertices y, z in S_x such that yz is an edge in S but not in S_x. So $C_3(x, y, z)$ is an induced 3-cycle in S, a contradiction. Thus, $\deg(x) = 3$. Say S_x is the 3-cycle

$C_3(x_1, x_2, x_3)$. Since this 3-cycle is not an induced cycle in S, it follows that $x_1x_2x_3 \in S$. Then $(x * S_x) \cup \{x_1x_2x_3\} = S_4^2$. Since a triangulation of S^2 can not be a proper subcomplex of another triangulation of S^2, it follows that $S = S_4^2$. □

Definition 4.2. A triangulated d-sphere S is said to be *primitive* if it can not be written as a connected sum of two triangulated d-spheres.

Clearly, every triangulated d-sphere is a connected sum of finitely many primitive d-spheres.

Lemma 4.3. *Let S be a triangulated d-sphere. Then S is primitive if and only if S has no induced subcomplex isomorphic to S_{d+1}^{d-1}.*

Proof. If S is not primitive, then $S = S_1 \# S_2$, where S_1 and S_2 are triangulated d-spheres. Let α be the unique common facet of S_1 and S_2. Then the boundary of $\overline{\alpha}$ is an induced S_{d+1}^{d-1} in S.

Conversely, suppose S has an induced S_{d+1}^{d-1}, say with vertex set α. This S_{d+1}^{d-1} divides S into two triangulated d-balls B_1 and B_2 such that $S = B_1 \cup B_2$, $\partial B_1 = \partial B_2 = B_1 \cap B_2 = S_{d+1}^{d-1}$. Put $S_i = B_i \cup \{\alpha\}$, $i = 1, 2$. Then S_1, S_2 are triangulated d-spheres and $S = S_1 \# S_2$. So S is not primitive. □

The following lemma and definition clarify the meaning of connected sums of several primitive triangulated spheres.

Notation 4.4. Let S be a triangulation of S^d. Let $\mathcal{A}(S) := \{\alpha \subseteq V(S) : S[\alpha] \cong S_{d+1}^{d-1}\}$, $\overline{S} := S \cup \mathcal{A}(S)$, and let $\mathcal{B}(S)$ be the collection of all the induced subcomplexes of the simplicial complex $\overline{S}$ which are primitive triangulations of S^d. Let $\mathcal{T}(S)$ be the graph with vertex set $\mathcal{B}(S)$ such that $S_1, S_2 \in \mathcal{B}(S)$ are adjacent in $\mathcal{T}(S)$ if $S_1 \cap S_2 = \overline{\alpha}$ for some $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}(S)$.

Lemma 4.5. *For any triangulated d-sphere S the following hold.*

(a) *Any two members of $\mathcal{B}(S)$ have at most one common facet; if they have a common facet α then $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}(S)$.*

(b) *Each member of $\mathcal{A}(S)$ belongs to exactly two members of $\mathcal{B}(S)$.*

(c) *There is a natural bijection from $\mathcal{A}(S)$ onto the set of edges of $\mathcal{T}(S)$. It is given by $\alpha \mapsto \{S_1, S_2\}$, where, for $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}(S)$, S_1 and S_2 are the two members of $\mathcal{B}(S)$ containing α.*

(d) *The graph $\mathcal{T}(S)$ is a tree. In consequence, $\#\mathcal{B}(S) = 1 + \#\mathcal{A}(S)$.*

Proof. Induction on $m := 1 + \#\mathcal{A}(S)$. If $m = 1$, $\mathcal{A}(S)$ is empty, so that S is primitive by Lemma 4.3. So let $m > 1$, and suppose that the result holds for all smaller values of m. In this case, $\mathcal{A}(S)$ is non-empty. Take $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}(S)$. By the proof of Lemma 4.3, there are triangulated d-spheres S', S'' such that $S' \cap S'' = \overline{\alpha}$, $S = (S' \cup S'') \setminus \{\alpha\}$. Thus, $S', S'' \subseteq S \cup \{\alpha\} \subseteq \overline{S}$. Hence it is easy to see that $\mathcal{A}(S) = \mathcal{A}(S') \sqcup \mathcal{A}(S'') \sqcup \{\alpha\}$, $\mathcal{B}(S) = \mathcal{B}(S') \sqcup \mathcal{B}(S'')$ and the graph $\mathcal{T}(S)$ is obtained from the disjoint union of the graphs $\mathcal{T}(S')$ and $\mathcal{T}(S'')$ by adjoining a single edge from a vertex of $\mathcal{T}(S')$ to a vertex of $\mathcal{T}(S'')$. By induction hypothesis, the result is valid for S' and S'', and its validity for S follows. This completes the induction. □

Definition 4.6. Let S be a triangulated d-sphere. Any tree has a leaf (a vertex of degree one) and the deletion of a leaf from a non-trivial tree leaves a subtree. Therefore, the members of $\mathcal{B}(S)$ may be ordered as $S_1, \ldots, S_m$ in such a way that, for each i, $1 \leq i \leq m$, S_i is a leaf of the induced subtree of $\mathcal{T}(S)$ on $\{S_1, \ldots, S_i\}$ (when $m \geq 2$, this ordering is not unique). For any such ordering, we write $S = S_1 \# S_2 \# \cdots \# S_m$, and say that S is the *connected sum* of the S_i's. Clearly, we have $S_1 \# \cdots \# S_m = (S_1 \# \cdots \# S_{m-1}) \# S_m$.

As a special case of [13, Theorem 8.5], Kalai proved a nice characterization of stacked 2-spheres. A triangulated 2-sphere S is stacked if and only if S has no induced cycle of length ≥ 4. The following result is an improvement on this characterization.

Theorem 4.7. *Let S be a triangulated 2-sphere. Then S is stacked if and only if it has no induced cycle of length 4 or 5.*

Proof. Write $S = S_1 \# S_2 \# \cdots \# S_k$, where the S_i's are primitive 2-spheres.

If S is stacked then, by Lemma 2.9, each S_i is a copy of S_4^2. Let C be an induced cycle of length ≥ 4 in S. Since an induced cycle of length ≥ 4 in a connected sum of two triangulated manifolds must be an induced cycle in one of the summands, it follows inductively that C is an induced cycle in one of the S_i's. Since S_4^2 has no induced cycle at all, it follows that S has no induced cycle of length ≥ 4. This proves the "only if" part.

For the converse, assume that S has no induced cycle of length 4 or 5. It follows that no S_i has any induced cycle of length 4 or 5. Being primitive, S_i has no induced cycle of length 3 either (Lemma 4.3). Thus, by Lemma 4.1, each S_i is a copy of S_4^2. Therefore, by Lemma 2.9, S is stacked. This proves the "if" part. □

Now we are ready to prove one of the main results of this paper.

Theorem 4.8. *A closed, triangulated 3-manifold M is tight with respect to some field $\mathbb{F}$ with $\mathrm{char}(\mathbb{F}) \neq 2$ if and only if M is orientable, neighbourly and stacked.*

Proof. The "if" part follows from Proposition 1.6. To prove the "only if" part, let M be an $\mathbb{F}$-tight, closed, triangulated 3-manifold, $\mathrm{char}(\mathbb{F}) \neq 2$. By Lemmas 2.2 and 2.5, M is neighbourly and orientable. It remains to show that M must be stacked.

Corollary 3.6 (b) shows that, for each vertex x of M, the vertex link M_x is a triangulated 2-sphere with no induced 4-cycle or 5-cycle. So, Theorem 4.7 implies that each M_x is a stacked 2-sphere. Thus, M is locally stacked. The result now follows by Proposition 1.6. □

Corollary 4.9. *Let M be a closed, triangulated 3-manifold. If M is tight with respect to a field $\mathbb{F}$, where $\mathrm{char}(\mathbb{F}) \neq 2$, then M is strongly minimal.*

Proof. This result follows from Theorem 4.8 and Proposition 1.7. □

Corollary 4.10. *Let M be a closed, triangulated 3-manifold. If M is tight with respect to a field of odd characteristic then M is tight with respect to all fields.*

Proof. Let M be $\mathbb{F}$-tight, where $\mathrm{char}(\mathbb{F})$ is odd. Then, by Theorem 4.8, M is orientable, neighbourly and stacked. The result now follows from Proposition 1.6. □

Corollary 4.11. *Let M be a closed, triangulated 3-manifold. If M is tight with respect to a field of odd characteristic then either* (i) *$M = S_5^3$ or* (ii) *$\beta := (f_0(M) - 4)(f_0(M) - 5)/20$ is an integer greater than one and M triangulates $(S^2 \times S^1)^{\# \beta}$.*

Proof. Let M be $\mathbb{F}$-tight, where $\mathrm{char}(\mathbb{F})$ is odd. Assume that $M \neq S^3_5$. Since the only tight triangulation of the sphere of dimension $d \geq 1$ is the standard sphere S^d_{d+2}, it follows that M is not a triangulated 3-sphere.

Since $\mathrm{char}(\mathbb{F}) \neq 2$, by Theorem 4.8, M is orientable, neighbourly and stacked. Therefore, by Proposition 2.11, M triangulates $(S^2 \times S^1)^{\#k}$ for some positive integer k. Then, $\beta_1(M;\mathbb{F}) = k$.

Since M is stacked, by Proposition 1.6, $(f_0(M)-4)(f_0(M)-5) = 20\beta_1(M;\mathbb{F}) = 20k$. So $(f_0(M)-4)(f_0(M)-5)/20 = k$. Thus, $\beta = (f_0(M)-4)(f_0(M)-5)/20$ is a positive integer and M triangulates $(S^2 \times S^1)^{\#\beta}$. Since there is no 9-vertex triangulation of $S^2 \times S^1$ (see [23]), it follows that $\beta \neq 1$. This completes the proof. □

5 Characteristic two

By Lemma 2.8, a simplicial complex is tight with respect to a field of characteristic two if and only if it is $\mathbb{Z}_2$-tight. So, without loss of generality, we take $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{Z}_2$ in this section. However, all the results apply equally well to arbitrary fields of characteristic two. Here, we characterize the links of $\mathbb{Z}_2$-tight, triangulated 3-manifolds. This characterization is important since it leads to (a) severe restrictions on the size and topology of such a triangulation (see Theorem 5.1, Corollary 5.12 and the tables at the end of this section) and (b) a polynomial time algorithm to decide tightness of 3-manifolds which is described in detail in [3].

By Proposition 1.6, all stacked, neighbourly, closed, triangulated 3-manifolds are $\mathbb{Z}_2$-tight. Here is a partial converse. (In case M is orientable, this result follows from Corollary 2.7.)

Theorem 5.1. *Let M be a $\mathbb{Z}_2$-tight, closed, triangulated 3-manifold. If the torsion subgroup of $H_1(M;\mathbb{Z})$ is of odd order (possibly trivial), then M is stacked (and neighbourly).*

Proof. Assume, on the contrary, that M is not stacked. Then, by Proposition 1.6, M is not locally stacked. So there exists a vertex v whose link M_v is not a stacked 2-sphere. By Theorem 4.7 and Corollary 3.6 (a), M_v has an induced cycle C of length 5. Then, by Theorem 3.5, the induced subcomplex $N := M[\{v\} \cup V(C)]$ of M is a closed, triangulated 2-manifold. Since N is an induced subcomplex of M, by Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3, N is neighbourly. Thus, N is a 6-vertex, neighbourly, triangulated 2-manifold and hence is the 6-vertex triangulation $\mathbb{RP}^2_6$ of $\mathbb{RP}^2$. Take a non-triangle abc of $N = \mathbb{RP}^2_6$ (there are 10 of them). Then $\alpha = ab + bc + ca$ can be viewed as a 1-cycle of N with $\mathbb{Z}_2$-coefficient as well as with $\mathbb{Z}$-coefficient. In both views, it is not a boundary. However 2α is a boundary with $\mathbb{Z}$-coefficient. Since the map $H_1(N;\mathbb{Z}_2) \to H_1(M;\mathbb{Z}_2)$, induced by the inclusion map $N \hookrightarrow M$, is injective, it follows that $[\alpha] \neq 0$ as an element of $H_1(M;\mathbb{Z}_2)$ and hence also as an element of $H_1(M;\mathbb{Z})$. But, $2[\alpha] = 0$ in $H_1(M;\mathbb{Z})$. So $[\alpha]$ is an element of order 2 in $H_1(M;\mathbb{Z})$. This is a contradiction to the assumption on $H_1(M;\mathbb{Z})$. □

Lemma 5.2. *Let S be a primitive triangulation of S^2. Suppose $S \neq S^2_4$ and S has no induced 4-cycle. Then,*

(a) *All vertex links of S are induced cycles in S.*

(b) *Any two adjacent vertices of S have exactly two common neighbours in S.*

Proof. Let $x \in V(S)$. Since $S \neq S_4^2$ is primitive, Lemma 4.3 implies that S_x can not be a 3-cycle. Let the vertices y, z of the cycle S_x be neighbours in S. Since S is primitive, the 3-cycle $C_3(x, y, z)$ can not be induced in S. So the triangle xyz is in S. Therefore, y and z are neighbours in S_x. This implies that S_x is induced in S. This proves part (a).

Let x, y be adjacent vertices of S, and let z be a common neighbour of x and y. Then, as the 3-cycle $C_3(x, y, z)$ is not induced in S, the triangle xyz is in S. So z is the third vertex of one of the two triangles of S through xy. Thus, x and y have exactly two common neighbours. This proves part (b). □

Lemma 5.3. *Let S be a primitive triangulation of S^2 such that S has no induced cycle of length $\equiv 1 \pmod 3$. Then, either $S = S_4^2$ or all the vertices of S have degree $2 \pmod 3$.*

Proof. By assumption and Lemma 5.2 (a), $V(S) = V_0 \sqcup V_2$, where V_i consists of the vertices of degree $i \pmod 3$, $i = 0, 2$. If possible, let $x \in V_0$ and $y \in V_2$ be such that xy is an edge of S. By Lemma 5.2, the cycles S_x and S_y are induced in S (of length 0 (mod 3) and 2 (mod 3), respectively) with exactly two common vertices, say u and v. Then u and v are the two neighbours of x in S_y and of y in S_x.

Claim. No vertex in $V(S_x) \setminus V(S_y)$ is adjacent to any vertex in $V(S_y) \setminus V(S_x)$.

Indeed, if $a \in S_x$ is a neighbour of $b \in S_y$, then S has the 4-cycle $C_4(x, a, b, y)$. Since S has no induced 3-cycle or 4-cycle, it follows that one of the triangles xya and xab is in S. Hence either a or b is in $S_x \cap S_y$. This proves the claim.

Therefore, if C is the cycle obtained from $S_x \cup S_y$ by deleting the two vertices x, y and the four edges xu, xv, yu, yv, then C is an induced cycle in S of length $\equiv 0 + 2 - 4 \equiv 1 \pmod 3$. This is a contradiction. Therefore, no vertex in V_0 is adjacent to any vertex in V_2. Since S is connected and $V(S) = V_0 \sqcup V_2$, it follows that $V_0 = \emptyset$ or $V_2 = \emptyset$. If $V_2 = \emptyset$ then the degree of each vertex is 0 (mod 3) and hence S has a vertex z of degree 3. Since S is primitive, S_z bounds a triangle. Then, S contains an S_4^2 and hence $S = S_4^2$. Otherwise, $V(S) = V_2$. □

Theorem 5.4. *Up to isomorphism, S_4^2 and I_{12}^2 are the only two primitive triangulations of S^2 with no induced cycle of length $\equiv 1 \pmod 3$.*

Proof. Clearly, S_4^2 has no induced cycle whatsoever. It is easy to see that all the induced cycles of I_{12}^2 are 5-cycles. (Indeed, these are precisely the twelve vertex links.) Thus, these two triangulations of S^2 are primitive with no induced cycle of length 1 (mod 3).

Conversely, let S be a primitive triangulation of S^2 with no induced cycle of length 1 (mod 3). Assume $S \neq S_4^2$. By Lemma 5.3, the minimum degree of the vertices of S is five. If all its vertices have degree 5, then $S = I_{12}^2$. So, suppose there is a vertex u with $\deg(u) > 5$. By Lemma 5.3, $\deg(u) \geq 8$. So S_u is a cycle of length ≥ 8. Therefore, we may choose vertices v_1, v_2, w_1, w_2 in S_u such that v_1, v_2 are at distance 2, w_1, w_2 are at a distance 2, and $\mathrm{dist}(v_i, w_j) \geq 2$, $i, j = 1, 2$, where all the distances are graphical distances measured along the cycle S_u. Let $D := (u * S_u) \cup (v_1 * S_{v_1}) \cup (v_2 * S_{v_2}) \cup (w_1 * S_{w_1}) \cup (w_2 * S_{w_2})$ (see Figure 1). The boundary of D is the union of six paths in S (drawn as circular arcs; edges of S are drawn as straight line segments). Here, the dotted paths might possibly be trivial (of length zero), but the following argument goes through even in these degenerate cases. Since S has no induced cycle of length ≤ 4, it is easy to see that these six paths intersect pairwise at most at common end points, and the six end points marked in Fig. 1 are distinct vertices of S. Thus, the boundary of D is a cycle and hence D is a disc.



Figure 1: Disc D in the proof of Theorem 5.4

Fix an index $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Consider the boundary C_i of the disc $(u*S_u) \cup (v_i*S_{v_i}) \cup (w_i*S_{w_i})$. Then the vertex set of C_i is the union of the vertex sets of S_u, S_{v_i}, S_{w_i} minus the three vertices u, v_i, w_i. By Lemma 5.2 (b), S_u and S_{v_i} (as also S_u and S_{w_i}) have exactly two common vertices. Since D is a disc, it follows that S_{v_i} and S_{w_i} have a unique vertex (namely, u) in common. Also, by Lemma 5.3, each of S_u, S_{v_i}, S_{w_i} have length 2 (mod 3). Therefore, the inclusion exclusion principle shows that the length of C_i is $\equiv 2+2+2-(2+2+1)-3 \equiv 1$ (mod 3). Therefore, C_i is not an induced cycle of S. Thus, there is an edge a_ib_i in S such that a_i and b_i are non-consecutive vertices in the cycle C_i. By the proof of Lemma 5.3, no vertex of $S_{v_i} \setminus S_u$ is adjacent in S with any vertex of $S_u \setminus S_{v_i}$; also no vertex of $S_{w_i} \setminus S_u$ is adjacent in S with any vertex of $S_u \setminus S_{w_i}$. Therefore, $a_i \in A_i^\circ$, $b_i \in B_i^\circ$ (see Fig. 1). That is, a_i is an interior vertex of the path A_i and b_i is an interior vertex of the path B_i.

Now consider the disc D' in S complementary to the disc D (i.e., $D' := S[V(S) \setminus \{u, v_1, v_2, w_1, w_2\}]$). Then, a_1b_1 and a_2b_2 are in D'. Clearly, a_1b_1 separates A_2° from B_2° in D' (i.e., A_2° and B_2° are in different connected components of $|D'| \setminus |a_1b_1|$). Therefore, the geometric edges $|a_1b_1|$ and $|a_2b_2|$ intersect at an interior point. This contradicts the very definition of the geometric realization of a simplicial complex. Thus, there is no vertex u of S with $\deg(u) > 5$. This completes the proof. □

Corollary 5.5. *For triangulations S of S^2, the following conditions are equivalent:*

(a) *S has no induced cycle of length* 1 *(mod* 3*),*

(b) *all the induced cycles of S have length* 3 *and* 5*, and*

(c) *S is a connected sum of S_4^2's and I_{12}^2's.*

(The statement in (c) includes the possibility that S is either icosian or stacked.)

Proof. Let S be as in (c). It follows that the only possible induced cycles in the summands are 5-cycles. Therefore, the only induced cycles in S are 3-cycles and 5-cycles. Thus, (c) ⇒ (b). Trivially, (b) ⇒ (a).

Now suppose (a) holds. Write $S = S_1 \# S_2 \# \cdots \# S_k$, where each S_i is primitive. Since S has no induced cycle of length 1 (mod 3), it follows that no S_i has an induced cycle of length 1 (mod 3). Therefore, by Theorem 5.4, each S_i is S_4^2 or I_{12}^2. Hence S is as in (c). Thus, (a) ⇒ (c). □

Now we can prove the second main result of this paper.

Theorem 5.6. *Let M be a $\mathbb{Z}_2$-tight, closed, triangulated 3-manifold. Then each vertex link of M is a connected sum of S^2_4's and I^2_{12}'s.*

Proof. This is an immediate consequence of Corollary 3.6 (a) and Corollary 5.5. □

The following result provides a recursive procedure for the computation of the sigma-star vector.

Theorem 5.7. *Let X_1 and X_2 be induced subcomplexes of a simplicial complex X and $\mathbb{F}$ be a field. Suppose $X = X_1 \cup X_2$ and $Y = X_1 \cap X_2$. If Y is k-neighbourly, $k \geq 2$, then $\sigma^*_i(X;\mathbb{F}) = \sigma^*_i(X_1;\mathbb{F}) + \sigma^*_i(X_2;\mathbb{F}) - \sigma^*_i(Y;\mathbb{F})$ for $0 \leq i \leq k-2$.*

Proof. Let us write $m_1 = f_0(X_1)$, $m_2 = f_0(X_2)$, $m = f_0(Y)$. Thus, $f_0(X) = m_1 + m_2 - m$. For notational convenience, we write $\tilde{\beta}_i(A)$ for $\tilde{\beta}_i(X[A];\mathbb{F})$, $A \subseteq V(X)$. Note that any subset A of $V(X)$ can be uniquely written as $A = A_1 \sqcup B \sqcup A_2$, where $A_1 \subseteq V(X_1) \setminus V(Y)$, $B \subseteq V(Y)$ and $A_2 \subseteq V(X_2) \setminus V(Y)$. Since Y is k-neighbourly, it follows from the exactness of the Mayer-Vietoris sequence that

$$\tilde{\beta}_i(A_1 \sqcup B \sqcup A_2) = \tilde{\beta}_i(A_1 \sqcup B) + \tilde{\beta}_i(A_2 \sqcup B) - \tilde{\beta}_i(B) \text{ for } 0 \leq i \leq k-2.$$

Therefore, we can compute

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma^*_i(X;\mathbb{F}) &= \frac{1}{m_1+m_2-m+1} \sum_{A_1,A_2,B} \frac{\tilde{\beta}_i(A_1 \sqcup B) + \tilde{\beta}_i(A_2 \sqcup B) - \tilde{\beta}_i(B)}{\binom{m_1+m_2-m}{\#(A_1 \sqcup A_2 \sqcup B)}} \\
&= \frac{1}{m_1+m_2-m+1} \left[\sum_{A_1,B} \tilde{\beta}_i(A_1 \sqcup B) \sum_{A_2} \frac{1}{\binom{m_1+m_2-m}{\#(A_1 \sqcup B)+\#(A_2)}} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \sum_{A_2,B} \tilde{\beta}_i(A_2 \sqcup B) \sum_{A_1} \frac{1}{\binom{m_1+m_2-m}{\#(A_2 \sqcup B)+\#(A_1)}} - \sum_{B} \tilde{\beta}_i(B) \sum_{A_1,A_2} \frac{1}{\binom{m_1+m_2-m}{\#(B)+\#(A_1 \sqcup A_2)}} \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{m_1+m_2-m+1} \left[\sum_{k=0}^{m_1} \sum_{\substack{A_1,B \\ \#(A_1 \sqcup B)=k}} \tilde{\beta}_i(A_1 \sqcup B) \sum_{\ell=0}^{m_2-m} \frac{\binom{m_2-m}{\ell}}{\binom{m_1+m_2-m}{\ell+k}} \right. \\
&\qquad + \sum_{k=0}^{m_2} \sum_{\substack{A_2,B \\ \#(A_2 \sqcup B)=k}} \tilde{\beta}_i(A_2 \sqcup B) \sum_{\ell=0}^{m_1-m} \frac{\binom{m_1-m}{\ell}}{\binom{m_1+m_2-m}{\ell+k}} \\
&\qquad \left. - \sum_{k=0}^{m} \sum_{\substack{B \\ \#(B)=k}} \tilde{\beta}_i(B) \sum_{\ell=0}^{m_1+m_2-2m} \frac{\binom{m_1+m_2-2m}{\ell}}{\binom{m_1+m_2-m}{\ell+k}} \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{m_1+1} \sum_{k=0}^{m_1} \sum_{\substack{A_1,B \\ \#(A_1 \sqcup B)=k}} \frac{\tilde{\beta}_i(A_1 \sqcup B)}{\binom{m_1}{k}} + \frac{1}{m_2+1} \sum_{k=0}^{m_2} \sum_{\substack{A_2,B \\ \#(A_2 \sqcup B)=k}} \frac{\tilde{\beta}_i(A_2 \sqcup B)}{\binom{m_2}{k}} \\
&\qquad - \frac{1}{m+1} \sum_{k=0}^{m} \sum_{\substack{B \\ \#(B)=k}} \frac{\tilde{\beta}_i(B)}{\binom{m}{k}} \\
&= \sigma^*_i(X_1;\mathbb{F}) + \sigma^*_i(X_2;\mathbb{F}) - \sigma^*_i(Y;\mathbb{F}).
\end{aligned}$$

□

In the penultimate step of the above computation, we have used the following well known identity to compute the inner sums. For any three non-negative integers p, q, r, we have

$$\sum_{i=0}^{p} \frac{\binom{p}{i}}{\binom{p+q+r}{i+r}} = \frac{p+q+r+1}{q+r+1} \times \frac{1}{\binom{q+r}{r}}.$$

As a particular case of Theorem 5.7, we have a formula for the sigma-star vector of a connected sum. Since $\sigma_0^*(X;\mathbb{F})$ is independent of the field $\mathbb{F}$, we denote it by $\sigma_0^*(X)$ in the following.

Corollary 5.8. *For any two triangulated d-spheres S_1, S_2 of dimension $d \geq 2$ and any field $\mathbb{F}$, we have*

(a) $\sigma_0^*(S_1 \# S_2) = \sigma_0^*(S_1) + \sigma_0^*(S_2) + \frac{1}{d+2}$, *and*

(b) $\sigma_i^*(S_1 \# S_2;\mathbb{F}) = \sigma_i^*(S_1;\mathbb{F}) + \sigma_i^*(S_2;\mathbb{F})$ *for* $1 \leq i \leq d-2$.

Proof. Let $S_1 \cap S_2 = \overline{\alpha}$, where α is a d-face. Then $X := S_1 \# S_2$, $X_1 := S_1 \setminus \{\alpha\}$, $X_2 := S_2 \setminus \{\alpha\}$, $Y = \partial\overline{\alpha} = S_{d+1}^{d-1}$ satisfy the hypothesis of Theorem 5.7 (with $k = d$), and trivially $\sigma_0^*(S_{d+1}^{d-1}) = -1/(d+2)$, $\sigma_i^*(S_{d+1}^{d-1}) = 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq d-2$. □

Notation 5.9. For $k, \ell \geq 0$; $(k,\ell) \neq (0,0)$, we denote by $kI_{12}^2 \# \ell S_4^2$ a triangulated 2-sphere which can be written as a connected sum of $k+\ell$ triangulated 2-spheres, of which k are copies of I_{12}^2 and the remaining ℓ are copies of S_4^2 (in some order).

Corollary 5.10. *Let $k, \ell \geq 0$ and $(k,\ell) \neq (0,0)$. Then $\sigma_0^*(kI_{12}^2 \# \ell S_4^2) = \frac{617}{1716}k + \frac{1}{20}\ell - \frac{1}{4}$.*

Proof. Trivially, $\sigma_0^*(S_4^2) = -1/5$. A computation shows that $\sigma_0^*(I_{12}^2) = 47/429$. Thus the result holds when $k + \ell = 1$. The general result follows by an induction on $k+\ell$, where the induction leap uses Corollary 5.8 (with $d = 2$). □

Our next result lists a set of necessary conditions that a $\mathbb{Z}_2$-tight, triangulated 3-manifold must satisfy. Note that the statement of the main result of [7] implies that the inequality in part (a) of Theorem 5.11 holds, more generally, for all triangulations of closed 3-manifolds. Equality holds in this more general setting only if the triangulation is neighbourly and locally stacked. Therefore, Proposition 1.6 implies that equality holds if and only if the triangulation is $\mathbb{Z}_2$-tight and stacked. Still, we have included this inequality for the sake of completeness, and because its proof arises naturally in the course of proving the rest of the theorem.

Theorem 5.11. *Let M be a $\mathbb{Z}_2$-tight, closed, triangulated 3-manifold. Then the parameters $n := f_0(M)$ and $\beta_1 := \beta_1(M;\mathbb{Z}_2)$ must satisfy the following.*

(a) $(n-4)(n-5) \equiv 20\beta_1 \pmod{776}$. *Also, $(n-4)(n-5) \geq 20\beta_1$, with equality if and only if M is stacked.*

(b) $429(n-4)(n-5) - 776n\lfloor\frac{n-4}{9}\rfloor \leq 8580\beta_1$. *Equality holds here if and only if each vertex link of M is a triangulated 2-sphere of the form $\lfloor\frac{n-4}{9}\rfloor I_{12}^2 \# (n-4-9\lfloor\frac{n-4}{9}\rfloor) S_4^2$.*

Proof. By Theorem 5.6, for each $x \in V(M)$ there are numbers $k(x)$ and $\ell(x)$ such that

$$M_x = k(x)I_{12}^2 \# \ell(x)S_4^2.$$

Since M is neighbourly by Lemma 2.2, equating the number of vertices in the two sides, we get $n-1 = 9k(x)+3+\ell(x)$. Hence $\ell(x) = n-4-9k(x)$, and we have $0 \leq k(x) \leq \lfloor \frac{n-4}{9} \rfloor$. Equality holds in the lower bound if and only if M_x is stacked, and equality holds in the upper bound if and only if M_x is the connected sum of $\lfloor \frac{n-4}{9} \rfloor$ copies of I_{12}^2 and $n-4-9\lfloor \frac{n-4}{9} \rfloor$ copies of S_4^2. Let us put $k := \sum_{x \in V(M)} k(x)$. Then $0 \leq k \leq n\lfloor \frac{n-4}{9} \rfloor$. The lower bound holds with equality if and only if M is locally stacked (hence, by Proposition 1.6, if and only if M is stacked) and the upper bound holds with equality if and only if each vertex link of M is the connected sum of $\lfloor \frac{n-4}{9} \rfloor$ copies of I_{12}^2 and $n-4-9\lfloor \frac{n-4}{9} \rfloor$ copies of S_4^2. Then, by Corollary 5.10,

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_0^*(M_x) &= \frac{617}{1716}k(x) + \frac{1}{20}\ell(x) - \frac{1}{4} = \frac{617}{1716}k(x) + \frac{1}{20}(n-4-9k(x)) - \frac{1}{4} \\ &= \frac{1}{20}n - \frac{194}{2145}k(x) - \frac{9}{20}. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Now Lemma 2.6 implies $\beta_1 = \mu_1(M) := 1 + \sum_x \sigma_0^*(M_x)$. Therefore, adding (1) over all $x \in V(M)$, we get

$$429((n-4)(n-5) - 20\beta_1) = 776k. \tag{2}$$

Since 776 is relatively prime to 429, the result follows from (2) and the above discussion on the bounds on k. □

Corollary 5.12 (An upper bound theorem for $\mathbb{Z}_2$-tight, triangulated 3-manifolds)**.** *Let M be a $\mathbb{Z}_2$-tight, closed, triangulated 3-manifold with $n := f_0(M)$, $\beta_1 := \beta_1(M;\mathbb{Z}_2)$. Then $(n-4)(617n-3861) \leq 15444\beta_1$. Equality holds here if and only if M is locally icosian.*

Proof. Since $\lfloor \frac{n-4}{9} \rfloor \leq \frac{n-4}{9}$, Theorem 5.11 (b) implies that $429(n-4)(n-5) - 776n(n-4)/9 \leq 8580\beta_1$. This simplifies to the given inequality. Clearly, equality holds here if and only if $n \equiv 4 \pmod 9$ and equality holds in Theorem 5.11 (b). □

Corollary 5.13. *Let M be a $\mathbb{Z}_2$-tight, closed, triangulated 3-manifold. If $f_0(M) \leq 71$ or $\beta_1(M;\mathbb{Z}_2) \leq 188$, then M is stacked.*

Proof. Suppose, if possible, M is not stacked. Then, by Theorem 5.11 (a), there is an integer $\ell \geq 1$ such that $(n-4)(n-5) = 776\ell + 20\beta_1$. Hence Corollary 5.12 implies

$$15444(n-4)(n-5) \geq 15444 \times 776\ell + 20(617n-3861)(n-4).$$

This inequality simplifies to

$$(n-2)^2 \geq 3861\ell + 4. \tag{3}$$

Case 1. $n \leq 71$. Hence, by (3), $3861\ell + 4 \leq (71-2)^2 = 4761$. Thus, $\ell = 1$. Therefore, $(n-4)(n-5) = 776 + 20\beta_1$ and $(n-2)^2 \geq 3861 + 4 > 62^2$. Thus, $n \geq 65$. But, $(n-4)(n-5) \equiv 776 \equiv -4 \pmod{20}$. Hence $n \equiv 12$ or $17 \pmod{20}$. But, $n \geq 65$. So $n \geq 72$, a contradiction. So the result is true in this case.
Case 2. $\beta_1(M;\mathbb{Z}_2) \leq 188$. Then, by Corollary 5.12, $n \leq 73$. Hence (3) yields $\ell = 1$. Thus $(n-4)(n-5) = 776 + 20\beta_1$, and therefore n is congruent to 12 or 17 (mod 20). Hence $n \leq 72$, and if $n = 72$ then $\beta_1 = 189$. Therefore, $n \leq 71$. The result now follows by Case 1. □

Corollary 5.14. *Let M be a closed, topological 3-manifold admitting a tight triangulation. If $\beta_1(M, \mathbb{Z}_2) < 189$, then M is homeomorphic to one of the following manifolds*

$$S^3,\ (S^2 \times S^1)^{\#k},\ (S^2 \tilde{\times} S^1)^{\#k},$$

where $k = 1, 12, 19, 21, 30, 63, 78, 82, 99, 154, 177$ or 183.

Proof. Let X be an n-vertex, tight triangulation of M. Then, by Corollary 5.13, Theorem 5.11 (a) and Proposition 2.11, M is homeomorphic to S^3, $(S^2 \times S^1)^{\#k}$ or $(S^2 \tilde{\times} S^1)^{\#k}$, where $(n-4)(n-5) = 20k$. The result follows from this. □

The following table gives a list of small values for the parameters (n, β_1) of a locally icosian $\mathbb{Z}_2$-tight, closed, triangulated 3-manifold. Indeed, the number n of vertices in any such triangulated 3-manifold must be congruent modulo 15444 to one of the eight values of n listed in this table.

n	1408	3865	5269	8320	9724	12181	13585	15448
β_1	78625	595186	1106970	2762081	3773610	5922778	7367441	9527555

Table 1: Small feasible parameters for locally icosian, $\mathbb{Z}_2$-tight 3-manifolds

The following tables list the small values for parameters (n, β_1) satisfying the conclusion of Theorem 5.11. Table 2 for (n, β_1) with strict inequality in part (a) of the theorem. Table 3 for (n, β_1) with equality in part (b) of the theorem.

n	72	77	92	96	97	101	108	112	113	116	117	121	128	132	133
β_1	189	224	344	341	389	388	458	539	511	544	594	601	685	774	748

Table 2: Small feasible parameters for non-stacked, $\mathbb{Z}_2$-tight 3-manifolds

n	825	1296	1408	1760	1881	1989	2145	2580	3168	3276
β_1	26871	66637	78625	123049	140677	157336	183109	264924	399817	427582

Table 3: Small feasible parameters for $\mathbb{Z}_2$-tight 3-manifolds (with equality in Th. 5.11 (b))

6 Examples

In this section, we present some examples which help to put the results of this paper in proper perspective.

The first example shows that a strongly minimal, stacked, closed, triangulated 3-manifold need not be tight. So the converse of Proposition 1.7 is not true.

Example 6.1 (Walkup [23])**.** Let $\mathcal{J}$ be the pure 4-dimensional simplicial complex with vertex set $\mathbb{Z}_{10} = \mathbb{Z}/10\mathbb{Z}$ and an automorphism $i \mapsto i+1 \pmod{10}$. Modulo this automorphism, there is only one representative facet (maximal face) of $\mathcal{J}$, namely 12345. The face vector of $\mathcal{J}$ is $(10, 40, 60, 40, 10)$. Each vertex link of $\mathcal{J}$ is an 8-vertex stacked 3-ball and hence $\mathcal{J}$

is a locally stacked, triangulated 4-manifold with boundary. The boundary $\mathcal{K} = \partial\mathcal{J}$ has face vector $(10, 40, 60, 30)$ and triangulates $S^2 \times S^1$. Since each 2-simplex of $\mathcal{J}$ is in the boundary, $\mathcal{J}$ is stacked and hence $\mathcal{K}$ is a stacked, closed, triangulated 3-manifold. Since $\mathcal{K}$ is not neighbourly, it is not tight with respect to any field.

Let Y be a triangulation of $S^2 \times S^1$. Since the only closed, triangulated 3-manifolds with at most 9 vertices are S^3 and $S^2 \tilde{\times} S^1$ (see [23]), it follows that $f_0(Y) \geq 10$. Then, by [21, Theorem 5.2], $f_1(Y) \geq 4f_0(Y) \geq 40$. Since $f_0(Y) - f_1(Y) + f_2(Y) - f_3(Y) = 0$ and $2f_2(Y) = 4f_3(Y)$, it follows that $f_3(Y) = f_1(Y) - f_0(Y) \geq 4f_0(Y) - f_0(Y) = 3f_0(Y) \geq 30$. Hence $f_2(Y) = 2f_3(Y) \geq 60$. Thus, $f_i(Y) \geq f_i(\mathcal{K})$ for $0 \leq i \leq 3$. Therefore, $\mathcal{K}$ is strongly minimal.

The following example shows that a neighbourly, locally stacked, closed, triangulated 3-manifold need not be stacked. Equivalently, it need not be tight. Thus, the hypothesis 'stacked' in Theorem 4.8 can not be relaxed to 'locally stacked'.

Example 6.2 (Lutz [17])**.** Let $\mathcal{L}$ be the pure 3-dimensional simplicial complex with vertex set $\mathbb{Z}_{10} = \mathbb{Z}/10\mathbb{Z}$ and an automorphism $i \mapsto i + 1 \pmod{10}$. Modulo this automorphism, a set of representative facets of $\mathcal{L}$ is:

$$1236,\ 1237,\ 1257,\ 1368.$$

Then, each vertex link is a 9-vertex stacked 2-sphere and hence $\mathcal{L}$ is a locally stacked, neighbourly, closed, triangulated 3-manifold. It triangulates $S^2 \times S^1$ and hence $\beta_1(\mathcal{L}; \mathbb{F}) = 1$ for any field $\mathbb{F}$. Therefore, by Proposition 1.6, $\mathcal{L}$ is not stacked and not tight with respect to any field. Since there are non-neighbourly 10-vertex triangulations of $S^2 \times S^1$ (cf. $\mathcal{K}$ in Example 6.1), $\mathcal{L}$ is not strongly minimal. By Propositions 1.7 and 1.6, this also shows that $\mathcal{L}$ is not stacked and is not $\mathbb{F}$-tight for any field $\mathbb{F}$. Since $\mathcal{L}$ is not stacked, $\mathcal{L}$ is not in $\mathcal{H}^4$ by Proposition 2.11.

The following example shows that an arbitrary $\mathbb{F}$-tight simplicial complex need not be strongly minimal (we do not know if it must be minimal in the sense of having the fewest number of vertices among all triangulations of its geometric carrier).

Example 6.3. Consider the neighbourly 2-dimensional simplicial complex X on the vertex set $\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ whose maximal faces are 123, 234 and 14. It is easy to see that X is $\mathbb{F}$-tight for any field $\mathbb{F}$. Observe that $|X|$ is also triangulated by the simplicial complex Z (on the same vertex set) whose maximal faces are 123, 14, 24. Thus, X is not strongly minimal. Therefore, Conjecture 1.3 is not true for arbitrary simplicial complexes.

Recall that a d-dimensional simplicial complex is a *pseudo-manifold* if (i) each maximal face is d-dimensional, (ii) each $(d-1)$-face is in at most two d-faces, and (iii) for any two d-faces α and β, there exists a sequence $\alpha = \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_m = \beta$ of d-faces such that $\alpha_i \cap \alpha_{i+1}$ is a $(d-1)$-face for $1 \leq i \leq m-1$. We now extend the definitions of stackedness and locally stackedness to pseudo-manifolds as follows.

Definition 6.4. A pseudo-manifold Q of dimension $d+1$ is said to be *stacked* if all its faces of codimension (at least) two are in the boundary ∂Q. A pseudo-manifold P without boundary of dimension d is said to be *stacked* if there is a stacked pseudo-manifold Q of dimension $d+1$ such that $P = \partial Q$. A pseudo-manifold is said to be *locally stacked* if all its vertex links are stacked pseudo-manifolds (with or without boundaries).

Example 6.5 (Emch [12])**.** Consider the 3-dimensional pseudo-manifold $\mathcal{P}$ with vertex set $\{1,\ldots,8\}$ and the facet-transitive automorphism group $\mathrm{PGL}(2,7) = \langle(12345678),(132645),(16)(23)(45)(78)\rangle$. Modulo this group, a facet representative is 1235. The link of each vertex is isomorphic to the 7-vertex torus T^2_7. Its face vector is $(8,28,56,28)$.

Since $\mathcal{P}$ is a 3-neighbourly pseudo-manifold with Euler characteristic 8, it follows that its integral homologies are torsion free and its vector of Betti numbers is $(1,0,8,1)$. Using its doubly transitive automorphism group, one may calculate easily that the sigma vector of T^2_7 (with respect to any field) is $(-1,8,1)$. Hence the mu-vector of $\mathcal{P}$ (with respect to any field) also equals $(1,0,8,1)$. Therefore, [2, Theorem 1.6] implies that $\mathcal{P}$ is tight with respect to all fields.

Now, if Q is a pseudo-manifold of dimension 4 such that $\partial Q = \mathcal{P}$ and $\mathrm{skel}_2(Q) = \mathrm{skel}_2(\mathcal{P})$ then for any vertex v of Q, we have $\partial(Q_v) = \mathcal{P}_v$ and $\mathrm{skel}_1(Q_v) = \mathrm{skel}_1(\mathcal{P}_v)$. Thus, Q_v is a stacked, triangulated 3-manifold whose boundary is the 7-vertex torus P_v. But it is easy to see that the 7-vertex torus bounds exactly three (distinct but isomorphic) stacked, triangulated 3-manifolds, each with seven 3-faces. This implies that $f_4(v{*}Q_v) = f_3(Q_v) = 7$. Then, $f_4(Q) = (8{\times}7)/5$, which is not possible. Therefore, $\mathcal{P}$ is not stacked. Thus, Theorems 4.8 and 5.1 are not true for 3-dimensional pseudo-manifolds.

The next example disproves a putative generalization of Theorem 3.5 in which the induced cycle in the hypothesis is replaced by arbitrary manifolds without boundary.

Example 6.6. Consider the 6-vertex triangulation $\mathbb{RP}^2_6$ of $\mathbb{RP}^2$ whose facets are 123, 134, 145, 156, 126, 235, 245, 246, 346, 356. Let $X = \overline{123456} \cup (7 * \mathbb{RP}^2_6)$. So X is the union of a standard 5-ball and a cone over $\mathbb{RP}^2_6$. The simplicial complex X is isomorphic to an induced subcomplex of the 13-vertex triangulation M of $SU(3)/SO(3)$ obtained by Lutz in [17]. (Indeed, for each vertex v of M, M_v contains two induced $\mathbb{RP}^2_6$'s, say $M_v[A]$ and $M_v[B]$, where $V(M_v) = A \sqcup B$. Both the induced subcomplexes $M[\{v\} \cup A]$ and $M[\{v\} \cup B]$ are isomorphic to X.) Thus, M is $\mathbb{Z}_2$-tight [16], $M_v[A] = \mathbb{RP}^2_6$ is a surface and yet the induced subcomplex $X = M[\{v\} \cup A]$ is not a pseudo-manifold.

Acknowledgements: The second and third authors are supported by DIICCSRTE, Australia (project AISRF06660) and DST, India (DST/INT/AUS/P-56/2013(G)) under the Australia-India Strategic Research Fund. The second author is also supported by the UGC Centre for Advanced Studies (F.510/6/CAS/2011 (SAP-I)).

References

[1] B. Bagchi, *A tightness criterion for homology manifolds with or without boundary*, European J. Combin. **46** (2015) 10–15.

[2] B. Bagchi, *The mu vector, Morse inequalities and a generalized lower bound theorem for locally tame combinatorial manifolds*, European J. Combin. **51** (2016) 69–83.

[3] B. Bagchi, B. A. Burton, B. Datta, N. Singh, J. Spreer, *Efficient algorithms to decide tightness*, arXiv:1412.1547, 2014.

[4] B. Bagchi, B. Datta, *Lower bound theorem for normal pseudomanifolds*, Expositiones Math. **26** (2008) 327–351.

[5] B. Bagchi, B. Datta, *On k-stellated and k-stacked spheres*, Discrete Math. **313** (2013) 2318–2329.

[6] B. Bagchi, B. Datta, *On stellated spheres and a tightness criterion for combinatorial manifolds*, European J. Combin. **36** (2014) 294–313.

[7] B. A. Burton, B. Datta, N. Singh, J. Spreer, *Separation index of graphs and stacked 2-spheres*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **136** (2015) 184–197.

[8] B. A. Burton, B. Datta, N. Singh, J. Spreer, A construction principle for tight and minimal triangulations of manifolds, arXiv:1511.04500, 2015.

[9] B. Datta, S. Murai, *On stacked triangulated manifolds*, arXiv:1407.6767, 2014.

[10] F. Effenberger, *Stacked polytopes and tight triangulations of manifolds*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **118** (2011) 1843–1862.

[11] F. Effenberger, J. Spreer, `simpcomp` – *a* `GAP` *toolkit for simplicial complexes*, Version 2.1.2, 2009–2015, https://github.com/simpcomp-team/simpcomp.

[12] A. Emch, *Triple and multiple systems, their geometric configurations and groups*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **31** (1929) 25–42.

[13] G. Kalai, *Rigidity and the lower bound theorem 1*, Invent. math. **88** (1987) 125–151.

[14] G. Kalai, I. Novik, F. Santos, V. Welker, *Geometric and Algebraic Combinatorics*, Oberwolfach Rep. **12** (2015), 285–368. doi: 10.4171/OWR/2015/5.

[15] W. Kühnel, *Tight Polyhedral Submanifolds and Tight Triangulations*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics **1612**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1995.

[16] W. Kühnel, F. Lutz, *A census of tight triangulations*, Period. Math. Hungar. **39** (1999) 161–183.

[17] F. H. Lutz, *Triangulated Manifolds with Few Vertices and Vertex-Transitive Group Actions*, Thesis (D 83, TU Berlin), Shaker Verlag, Aachen, 1999.

[18] P. McMullen, D. W. Walkup, *A generalized lower bound conjecture for simplicial polytopes*, Mathematika **18** (1971) 264–273.

[19] S. Murai, *Tight combinatorial manifolds and graded Betti numbers*, Collect. Math. **66** (2015) 367–386.

[20] S. Murai, E. Nevo, *On r-stacked triangulated manifolds*, J. Algebraic Combin. **39** (2014) 373–388.

[21] I. Novik, E. Swartz, *Socles of Buchsbaum modules, complexes and posets*, Adv. Math. **222** (2009) 2059–2084.

[22] J. Spreer, *Necessary conditions for the tightness of odd-dimensional combinatorial manifolds*, European J. Combin. **51** (2016) 475–491.

[23] D. W. Walkup, *The lower bound conjecture for 3- and 4-manifolds*, Acta Math. **125** (1970) 75–107.